

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NAVAJO ACADEMY

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1991

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the important work of the Navajo Academy, a preparatory school in my district that has encouraged better education for native American students for the past 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, this educational institution is one of a kind. It provides many students with the education and encouragement they need to continue on to college. Often those individuals who continue their education return to the reservation to pass their knowledge on to the next generation of native American students. I invite my colleagues to learn more about this organization and insert a Time magazine article into the RECORD for their review.

[From Time, Dec. 3, 1990]

AMERICAN SCENE: FARMINGTON, NEW MEXICO—CAUGHT BETWEEN EARTH AND SKY
(By Richard Stengel)

"It was the medicine men," the teacher tells the class, "who came up with the religious beliefs that are the backbone of our Navajo culture." Lloyd House speaks in a gravelly voice, has a boxer's much broken nose and wears a traditional turquoise necklace around his neck. "The medicine man we are talking about today was called Naahwitbihi—which means the 'man who always wins.' Sounds like Frank Sinatra, doesn't it?" he says, and chuckles.

The high school students, all Navajos, all shy and soft-spoken, all wearing high-topped sneakers and distressed blue jeans, don't seem to know or care who Ol' Blue Eyes is. On this spring day they are more interested in completing their model hogans, the round, age-old Navajo structures whose doorways must always face east, the direction of dawn, the region of all beginnings.

Until last summer, House, a former Marine Corps and All-Service welter-weight boxing champion, was one of two instructors in Navajo language and culture at the Navajo Academy in Farmington, N. Mex. This fall there are three, but House is no longer among them. The academy draws its students from the vast, mostly desolate Navajo reservation next to this charm-free oil-and-gas town. The school has a Navajo headmaster and an all-Navajo board of trustees. It is the only Native American college-preparatory boarding school in the U.S.

The academy, which will celebrate its 15th anniversary at the end of this school year, has 176 students in grades 9 through 12. Almost all are Navajos—the Diné, as they call themselves, which means the "People." This year there are also three Anglos, as whites around here are invariably called. Nestled against a high shelf of rock, the school consists of a snug quadrangle of dilapidated buildings on the grounds of a turn-of-the-century Methodist mission. It has a pleasant

atmosphere and, if you blur your eyes a bit, looks like a down-at-the-heels New England prep school transferred to a bleak section of the Southwest.

The school was started in 1976 at the time when the Indian Self-Determination Act was passed, when the Federal Government was encouraging Native Americans to take their education into their own hands. Until the 1970s, the dominant principle of the Bureau of Indian Affairs was assimilation, and the government was content to let Navajo culture wither away and die.

Although the U.S. government has had a trust responsibility since 1868 to provide for Navajo education, it has done a sorry job. Native Americans in general, and Navajos in particular, have one of the nation's highest rates of illiteracy and high school delinquency. The average Navajo adult has received only five years of schooling. Today half the Navajos on the reservation are under the age of 20, and perhaps a quarter of those teenagers are not in school. A third of all high school-age Native Americans are classified as educationally handicapped.

From the start, the academy sought to provide a supportive environment for Navajos, in contrast to public schools, where they were routinely treated as second-class students. But beyond that, according to headmaster Samuel Billison, the academy had a special mission: to educate young and gifted Navajos to be able to survive in the wider culture without losing their own. The school aimed to create a generation of Indian leaders who would understand the outside world but not envy it.

The school grew slowly and steadily. It offered small classes and recruited a corps of solid, no-nonsense teachers, some of whom are still there. To be admitted, Navajo students had to score at or above the 40th percentile nationally—that is, better than 39% of all U.S. students. That may not sound too stringent, but those young Native Americans who could meet that requirement were among the top fifth of all Navajo students.

Pale sunlight streams into the spare classroom of Richard Clark, an Anglo English teacher. Clark, an austere-looking man with a crew cut and a deeply lined face, has been teaching at the academy for nine years. At the blackboard, several sophomores are diagramming sentences. A timid girl with glasses identifies a predicate phrase modifying a compound verb. When she's finished, Clark scans the room and says with a wry smile, "Paulette, you're the next volunteer." Paulette, a tiny girl with large pompadour, dutifully marches to the blackboard and, in a spidery hand, diagrams a sentence with a nonrestrictive relative clause.

Clark is strict but sympathetic. "We're making up for all that they didn't learn on the reservation," he says. "But they learn fast." The curriculum at the academy, which includes four years of a foreign language, is considerably more rigorous than that of public schools on the reservation. Clark says that when the students arrive at school, fresh off the reservation, they are often ashamed by their lack of education and are painfully reticent. "Every year," says Clark,

"we get students who are at fourth- or fifth-grade reading levels."

Clark recounts that some of the students find the work too tough at the academy and leave to attend public school. "But then they come back because they miss the structure," he says. This was the case with Steve, a slight boy with spiky hair who sits in the back of Clark's class. He dropped out of the academy last year and enrolled at one of the local public high schools. The reason, he says, was "because I thought it would be easier." But public school proved too easy. "I couldn't learn over there," he says. Steve wants to go to college, and he says he has a better chance if he graduates from the academy. More than 80% of the school's graduates go to college, an extraordinarily high percentage for Native Americans.

Paulette was at a public school before coming to the academy. "Here the students really care," she says. "The kids at public school are rezzed out." This phrase provokes snickers from the class. *Rezzed out* means being provincial, unsophisticated, too much of the reservation. Those kids, she implies, don't care about studying. Claude, a barrel-chested tackle on the football team, came to the academy from a public school in Arizona. "At the public school," he says, "the guys would just drink and party. Here is a better atmosphere." If a student at the academy is caught drinking—or smoking dope, which is rapidly replacing alcohol as the abuse substance of choice among teenagers—he or she is immediately sent home.

The students have grown more assimilated over the years, says Martha Amedeo, who has taught literature and drama at the academy from the beginning. Today the Navajo language is a foreign tongue to more than half the students, who must struggle through two years of the difficult, tonal language of their forefathers. Amedeo notes that a few years ago the girls wore their perfectly straight black hair long and natural. Now all the girls in her class sport frizzy permanents.

When it comes to mainstream America, the students feel ambivalent—or, as a medicine man might put it, caught on the horizon, part of neither Earth nor sky. Curious but wary, they regard American culture as though they were gazing at it through a ritzy department-store window. They appreciate the academy in part because it is insulated from the outside world. Although nearly all of them intend to go to college, most say they will return to the reservation afterward. For Denneilia, a clever, pretty girl who was last year's senior-class president, the sky is the limit for what she could achieve in the outside world. Yet she admits that she will probably return to the reservation after college. The real world is prejudiced against Navajos, she says, adding that it is important that she not forsake her cultural heritage.

The Navajo Academy was growing steadily until about four years ago, when tensions between the academy and the Methodists resulted in a rupture. The mission wanted more rent. When the academy would not or could not pay it, the mission tried to evict the school. The academy went to court, get-

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

ting a three-year stay until the end of the school year in 1991. The Methodist Church recently filed suit to force the school to comply with the court order and depart by June of next year.

Meanwhile, the board of trustees has come up with a plan to build a new school on land donated by the Navajo Nation. The land was freely given—640 acres, to be exact—but where would the money come from? Not the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which allocated a paltry sum—\$8.1 million for fiscal 1991—to finance new construction of all Native American schools. Instead, the academy drafted a prospectus for a new institution costing \$31 million. The academy proposed an innovative fund-raising technique to the BIA: the school would raise the money through a private bond issue, and the BIA would allocate yearly mortgage payments over 30 years for the cost of construction. At the same time, the academy began lobbying for a congressional appropriation to underwrite the new school. Two bills were introduced in Congress this year to help the school, but no money was appropriated. Instead, the two Senators from New Mexico have directed the Department of the Interior to submit a report by February 1991 to the appropriations committee on the special needs of the academy.

The BIA insists that without a congressional guarantee the bureau cannot make such a lengthy fiscal commitment. The bureau also has some concerns about the way the school has been run. It has a point. The trustees seem out of touch with the daily life of the school and amateurish when it comes to financial matters. Some of the teachers are journeymen with little commitment to Navajo education. The school's long-term financial problems are compounded by a short-term one: the academy is facing a deficit of about \$150,000 this year. Despite some conflict among teachers, students and administrators, they are united on one issue: the academy is a source of pride to the Navajo Nation and ought to be preserved.

Headmaster Billison is concerned about the future—but not despairing. He has the face and manner of a world-weary sage and notes that his grandfather and several uncles were medicine men. The Navajo Beauty Way, he says, is to seek harmony with the world. Whatever happens, he will make peace with it. He mentions that the target date for breaking ground for the new school is next year and gestures toward the handsome architectural plans on his wall. "The Navajo philosophy," he says, "is that you always think positively."

FORMER PRESIDENT NIXON ON THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1991

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, some people have questioned why we are involved in the current conflict in the Middle East.

Perhaps no one in this Nation knows more about U.S. foreign policy and the world situation than does former President Richard Nixon.

His views on this issue were the subject of a recent editorial which ran in the Knoxville News-Sentinel and Scripps-Howard newspapers all across the country.

I commend this to the attention of my colleagues and others.

NIXON ON THE GULF CRISIS

Folks bicker endlessly about Richard Nixon's place in American history, but nobody can gainsay the old fellow's shrewdness in foreign affairs. What he says on the subject is almost always worth listening to.

That holds especially for a speech Nixon delivered recently in New York City. In it he accomplished what critics continually insist President Bush has failed to do: He outlined a concise and coherent explanation of why we are in the gulf.

There's no point, Nixon said, in denying the more mundane motivations that brought U.S. forces to Saudi Arabia. Oil is one powerful reason; the protection of American jobs is another. But the survival of democracy and the barbarism of Saddam Hussein are no reasons at all—the White House's high-flown rhetoric notwithstanding. Refreshingly, Nixon concedes that the restoration of the Kuwait emirate would scarcely advance the cause of democracy, and that if the U.S. were solely concerned with punishing state cruelty it would not now be allied with Assad's Syria.

No, says Nixon, we are in the gulf for two reasons. First, Saddam Hussein has shown an insatiable appetite for power in one of the world's vital regions. Aggression unchecked inevitably expands, and since Saddam won't stop himself, someone else will have to—now. Otherwise, says Nixon, "we will have to stop him later, when the cost in the lives of young Americans will be infinitely greater."

Second, Saddam is in danger of setting a precedent for other potential aggressors in the post-Cold War world. If the United States fails to roll back Saddam, its future warnings against aggression will be toothless—and hence ignored. Any control we can exert over world events today will be lost; U.S. power, which has been a force for good over the past half century, will be greatly diminished. That's why, says Nixon, "our commitment in the gulf is a highly moral enterprise."

Nixon's vision of America's role is internationalist. He sees that, like it or not, the United States has to play a central part in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East. International stability will always be essential to U.S. interests, and there will be times when we will be its sole guarantor. Now is such a time. This is a hard-headed, unsentimental view of the world, and the United States is fortunate that President Bush shares it. If only he were better at expressing it.

JOHN SANDOVAL, HAYWARD'S HISTORIAN, CELEBRATES HIS 85TH BIRTHDAY

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1991

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. John Sandoval of Hayward, in California's Ninth Congressional District, on the occasion of his 85th birthday. Mr. Sandoval, a noted historian, has been involved in the life of the city of Hayward for over 50 years.

John Sandoval was born in Sonora, CA, in 1906 and moved to Hayward in 1923. In 1927, he graduated cum laude from U.C. Berkeley.

From 1940 to 1946, he was a member of the City Library Commission. In 1946, he served as the secretary to the Postwar Planning Commission. He also served on the street naming committee for 30 years, from 1950 to 1980. In 1976, he was a member of the bi-centennial committee and, in 1978, he became the Hayward city historian. In 1988, he was nominated to become an honorable member of the Friends of the Library.

Throughout his distinguished career, Mr. Sandoval published a number of historical works. He is the author of such works as the "Trilogy—History of Hayward, Castro Valley and San Lorenzo"; "History of Hayward, Chapel of Chimes"; "History of Mt. Eden"; pageant—"150 Anniversary Mission of San Jose"; pageant—"Adobe of Don Guillermo Castro"; and, the "History of Hayward"—pageant for the dedication of Cal State, Hayward.

John Sandoval was also a member of numerous other organizations. He has been a member of the Rotary Club since 1938 and, in 1980, received the "Outstanding Rotarian of the Year" award. He is also a honorary member of both the Hayward and the Mount Eden Lions and in 1978 was named the "Most Distinguished Citizen" by the Hayward Lions Club. He is also an Honorary member of the Hayward Kiwanis Club.

Mr. Sandoval was also the founding member of the Hayward Historical Society in 1958. From 1978 to 1985, he was a member of the faculty at Chabot College where he taught local history. In 1986, he became Alameda County's designated historian, and in 1979, he was voted "Citizen of the Year" by KPIX Channel 9.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate John Sandoval on his 85th birthday and to commend him for years of dedicated service to the communities of California's Ninth Congressional District.

TRIBUTE TO COMMEMORATE UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1991

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, January 22, 1991, will mark to Ukrainians around the world, and particularly the Ukrainian community in the 12th Congressional District of Michigan, comprising Macomb and St. Clair counties, the commemoration of the 73d anniversary of the creation of the democratic Ukrainian National Republic. On that same day, the Ukrainians also will observe the 72d anniversary of the act of union whereby all Ukrainian lands were united into one state of the Ukraine Nation.

That young fledgling nation, soon after its formation, fell victim to Soviet imperialism. Although the Ukrainian National Republic was recognized as independent by a number of nations, it was subjected to attacks by the Soviet Government in Moscow. By 1920, the independent government of Ukraine could no longer withstand the pressure of Communist aggression. It was incorporated into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics [U.S.S.R.] and a

puppet government was installed without the support or consent of the Ukrainian people.

Since that time the Ukrainian people have struggled to shed themselves of a government imposed on them by Russian Communists—a government, Mr. Speaker, which has worked hard to crush the Ukrainian identity and spirit. The evidence of the Soviet Union's attempt to wipe the existence of Ukrainian culture off the face of the Earth is a black mark on the U.S.S.R.'s history. Examples of this include the mass exterminations in the twenties, induced famines in the thirties, Stalinist terror in the forties, and bureaucratic and regulatory carelessness which resulted in the Chernobyl disaster in the 1990's.

The determined struggle of the people of Ukraine against the tyranny imposed on them by Moscow, coupled with the sweeping social and democratic movements in Eastern Europe has forced the Soviet Government into a position of change. Over the past year we have seen the process of reestablishing the traditional religious values of the Ukrainian people. In defiance of the Soviet Union the newly formed democratized Ukraine Parliament voted in favor of a series of laws designed to eventually return Ukraine to the status of a sovereign nation. Though the Communist regime has tried to crush the religious, social, and cultural identity of Ukraine, it is clear they cannot crush the will of the Ukrainian people to once again be free and independent.

Mr. Speaker, January 22 signifies a very special day for on it we pause to think of the valiant struggle for independence which goes on each day halfway around the world in Ukraine. I urge my colleagues and all Americans to reflect on this ongoing struggle and lend their moral support to the Ukrainian people in their quest to be among the family of free nations.

THE PERSIAN GULF: IS THIS THE TIME FOR WAR?

HON. JAMES A. McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1991

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the level of fear that exists in this country so high since the Cuban missile crisis. Our President has put us at the brink of full-scale war in the Persian Gulf, and the citizens I have talked with do not understand why we are rushing headlong toward this war.

How is it that we find ourselves having deployed the largest number of troops since Vietnam? How is it that we find ourselves suddenly entrenched in one of the most volatile and war-torn regions in the world, preparing for war—in a land we do not know, amid cultures we do not understand, among nations that are undemocratic?

Who are these countries, Iraq and Kuwait, suddenly at the center of world events? They are young nations; Iraq became a British-mandated territory after World War I and its boundaries were drawn in 1922 by the British. Almost from the beginning, it was plagued by internal revolt and border disputes in the south. Although Iraq became independent in

1932, British control of that country essentially continued until revolution in 1958. Kuwait became independent in 1961, but even then, Britain had to send troops to the area because of Iraqi claims to Kuwaiti territory. Another set of border disputes in the region escalated to war between Iran and Iraq in 1980. But until last August, the United States rarely focused much attention on these disputes.

And what about our own relationship with Iraq? Are we at the brink of war because of a long history of conflict with this country, a pattern of behavior we could no longer tolerate, despite numerous efforts to halt it? Hardly. Saddam Hussein became President in 1979. The next year he invaded Iran. Were we outraged, threatened, alarmed at this naked aggression? Was the world community mobilized to action? In fact, Saddam knew he had our tacit consent. Iraq was, in effect, our surrogate army to fight a proxy war with the Ayatollah. Further, the United States joined numerous other countries in assisting Iraq in its war, even sending naval forces to the gulf in 1987 to protect reflagged Kuwaiti vessels from Iranian attack.

When Iraq brutally attacked its own Kurdish population, did we condemn these human rights violations in the strongest terms? Yes and no. The administration condemned the use of chemical weapons, yet throughout the late 1980's the United States continued to expand economic assistance and cooperation with Iraq. Congressional efforts in 1988 to impose sanctions on Iraq were blocked by the administration, which continued to oppose them up until the August invasion.

In April 1990, when Saddam threatened to "burn half of Israel," the United States was silent. And in the days before the invasion, when Iraq was building up troops on its border with Kuwait, did the United States warn Iraq that any aggressive action would be swiftly countered? Hardly. On July 25, our ambassador told Saddam that "we don't have much to say about Arab-Arab differences, like your border difference with Kuwait." And on July 31, questioned about an invasion scenario and whether the United States would defend Kuwait, the Assistant Secretary of State testified that "We have no defense treaty relationship with any gulf country * * *. We have historically avoided taking a position on border disputes."

There is no question Saddam Hussein is a tyrant, a ruthless, vicious dictator. But we have known that for years and still we helped him when he invaded Iran; we did nothing when he committed atrocities against his own people; we buried our heads in the sand when the alarm sounded on Kuwait and for a decade the past administration and this one did nothing, absolutely nothing, to develop a national energy policy, to break our addiction to oil, to reduce our dependence on foreign supplies, or diminish our economic vulnerability to dictators like Saddam. It is not enough to shrug and say, as the previous President did about another Mideast disaster, that "mistakes were made." We are asking 400,000 American men and women to pay for those mistakes.

And so we find ourselves on the precipice of war. But is war the way to correct the mistakes and failures of diplomacy? "I am convinced that peace will not be established by

military means. Sooner or later the issue is bound to be settled at the conference table. Eventually, why not now? That is the question Senator Ernest Gruening posed on August 6, 1964, during debate of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution—and that is the question we should be asking ourselves now.

But this administration seems bent on war rather than the continued pressure of sanctions, diplomacy, and negotiation. Despite the views of numerous military experts, this administration is convinced war is the only viable alternative. And it seems to have convinced itself that war is not only inevitable but winnable—and quickly winnable. I am reminded of another, war born out of failures of diplomacy and the rush to battle. When Austria declared war on Serbia in 1914 no one envisioned the conflagration that would ensue. But one prescient observer had noted a few years earlier that the next war "will be a national war which will not be settled by a decisive battle but by a long wearisome struggle with a country that will not be overcome until its whole national force is broken, and a war which will utterly exhaust our own people, even if we are victorious." Britain, France, and Germany expect a quick victory, and we know how tragically wrong they were. More recently, no one expected the Vietnam conflict to drag our Nation into more than a decade of relentless battle and near-civil war at home, but it did.

And even when we do win, what have we won? A gulf war could cause thousands, perhaps tens of thousands of deaths and casualties; and lead to wider war in the region; invite terrorist retaliation against the United States; stimulate a regional arms buildup; require a prolonged U.S. military presence; and in general, destabilize the region rather than achieving the stability we seek. It also might teach us a lesson we have refused to learn in the past—that cozying up to dictators like the Shah of Iran, Manuel Noriega, Saddam Hussein, and most recently, Syria's Hafez el Assad can have a tragic price.

We must consider the precedent we will set for future policy. Would every act of aggression require our military intervention? In a new world order are we to be the new world army?

And if we are to engage in war, who makes that decision? How do we ensure the American people have a voice in that decision? In his ruling on the lawsuit that 54 of us filed to challenge the President's authority to go to war unilaterally, Judge Harold Greene wrote:

If the Executive had the sole power to determine that any particular offensive military operation, no matter how vast, does not constitute war-making but only an offensive military attack, the congressional power to declare war will be at the mercy of a semantic decision by the Executive. Such an interpretation would evade the plain language of the Constitution * * *. Here, the forces involved are of such magnitude and significance as to present no serious claim that a war would not ensue if they became engaged in combat, and it is therefore clear that congressional approval is required * * *.

Congress does not have to debate the right to debate. America's democratic tradition demands it, and the Constitution protects it. We are not undermining our President when we debate policy—we are fulfilling our obligation under the Constitution. And if we dissent, we

are not trying to undercut him, but to protect him—and our country—from a costly mistake. Democracy requires eternal vigilance, and we must be vigilant in preserving the power of Congress to provide the crucial checks and balances on Executive power the framers intended. To wage war without such question or debate—and without congressional approval—is to sacrifice the principles for which we are sending our men and women to fight, the principles which we, no less than they, have sworn to uphold.

We already have allowed this President and the last one to expand Executive power and erode congressional authority. We are on the verge of sacrificing the Constitution to the god of war. If we cannot discuss the consequences of military action before invoking it, we have ceded all power of war to the Executive. Are we to learn, only after the fact, the reasons for and the costs of our actions? Are we to rely solely on the executive branch for the rationale and decisionmaking of the most important step a nation may take?

Based on our recent history, I do not think that is wise. Vietnam was a case history in governmental lies and deception. We were told then that war was essential to defend our national interests, but history has surely proved our vital interests were never at stake. We were told Vietnam was a war we could win—and that we were winning it—but we learned all too painfully those were sheer delusions. Throughout the 1960's we were told that Nicaragua was a threat to our hemisphere and therefore we were justified in violating international law by mining its harbors and arming the Contras. We were told our troops were needed to bring peace to Lebanon in 1983, but we learned another painful lesson there. We were told that Grenada was about to fall into the clutches of Cuba and the Soviet Union and that American students there were in grave danger, but later we learned that, as the New York Times put it, "there was more ignorance than evidence" behind those threats. I could go on and on about the times Presidents have cried wolf in the interests of national security and risked American lives for their senseless wars.

Is it possible that we are hearing similar exaggerated claims, scare tactics, inflated rhetoric, and distortions today?

The President initially said his mission in deploying troops was "wholly defensive." Yet, 2 days after the election he doubled our forces there, though there was no indication—none—that more troops were needed to maintain our defensive mission. In fact, he announced the troops were needed to "ensure that the coalition has an adequate offensive military option."

For 2 months in September and October, the President said the sanctions were working and the crisis would require patience, yet suddenly in December he decided he had "not been one who has been convinced that sanctions alone would bring Saddam to his senses."

The President said we are dealing with "Hitler revisited" and a brutal regime. But if brutality were a reason for going to war, then we would find ourselves deployed throughout half the world. The President is right to condemn the human rights atrocities that Saddam has

committed, acts that outrage us all. But he is wrong to suggest that such abuses are a cause for war when he has failed to speak out against other, equally brutal, human rights violations throughout the world.

Last week the President said that Saddam is a "worldwide threat to democracy." But except for Israel, there are no democracies in the Middle East to be threatened. Kuwait does not even grant women the right to vote. And if there is a direct threat to the United States, we have yet to hear precisely what it is.

In October the President said "the fight isn't about oil," yet last week he said that "the added weight of higher oil prices is a crushing burden Eastern Europe and Latin America cannot afford. And our own economy is suffering, suffering the effects of higher oil prices and lower growth stemming from Saddam's aggression." The Secretary of State said in September that "what is at stake economically is the dependence of the world on access to the energy resources of the Persian Gulf." Yet some countries far more dependent on Persian Gulf oil than we are have not sent one soldier—not one—to the gulf. In fact, before the August invasion, Iraq and Kuwait supplied less than 4 percent of our demand for oil. Are we to believe that our national security and our way of life are threatened to the point of war because less than 4 percent of our oil supply was temporarily disrupted?

Oil and energy are vital. But the national interest would be better served by developing a coherent energy policy within the Department of Energy, not the Department of Defense. Before he left office, President Carter had laid the groundwork for an energy policy that would have reduced our dependence on oil. But the Reagan administration slashed the budget for renewable energy resources and the Bush administration has opposed important conservation efforts. Even after Iraq's invasion exposed our energy policy vacuum, the administration still seems to miss the point. White House officials have insisted on removing conservation requirements from the Department of Energy's draft national energy plan. This administration would rather meet our energy needs with coastal drilling and desert wars than with conservation, creative technologies, and common sense.

The President has suggested that we must go to war to prevent the development and spread of chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons in Iraq. Yet just last summer the administration said, "We do not believe that Iraq poses a near-term nuclear proliferation threat." And our Armed Forces are not authorized to be the nuclear proliferation police for the world. If the President were serious about stopping nuclear proliferation, he would embrace efforts to negotiate the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which, as we speak, is being discussed at a conference in New York. Such a treaty would bolster the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty that we have signed. And if he wants to stop the proliferation of chemical weapons, he should not have vetoed legislation Congress passed last year to impose sanctions on foreign companies that assist the spread of chemical and biological weapons.

And finally, there is Secretary Baker's explanation that "if you want to sum it up in one

word, it's jobs." Quite simply, that is an insult to every man and woman in our military.

I share with our President a vision of a new world order. And I believe this is a historic opportunity to initiate it. But a new world order cannot be based on the old primitive urge to resolve conflicts through violence. And if a new world order means that the United States becomes the sheriff to the world, then I reject it. If a new world order means that we continue to rely on the force of our arms rather than the strength of our ideas, then I reject it. And if a new world order means that we will end the era of the cold war by starting a new era of the holy war, then I reject it.

A new world order must be founded on the principle of justice and peaceful resolution of conflicts. The President says that with the Baker-Aziz meeting he has gone the extra mile. But we have spent 5½ months preparing for war and only 6 hours in talks trying to prevent it. I am unwilling to send our men and women to war after only 6 hours of effort at direct talks. In a new world order, we must emphasize peaceful alternatives to solve our problems and turn to war as a last resort. In this case, we should continue to rely on the economic sanctions to exert pressure on Iraq, encourage diplomatic efforts, and begin to address the long-term problems of oil dependency, nuclear proliferation, and persistent Middle East conflict that surround this crisis.

There are times when the threat to our survival is so great that we must respond with force. There are times when peaceful efforts fail and force is our last and only resort. But this is not that time and the Middle East is not that place.

During the congressional recess, I met with hundreds of my constituents to discuss the gulf crisis. Almost 90 percent of them oppose offensive action by the United States. The people I represent do not want to go to war and the message they gave me is very clear: they will not support a war in the gulf.

History is an incisive judge. Our actions in the next few days will determine how we are judged in this crisis. We have been silent too long in the face of military adventurism by our Presidents, and acquiesced too often in wars and actions waged for vague purposes.

There is talk now of efforts by other parties at resolving this crisis. I pray they are successful. But I regret that our Government has neither initiated nor supported these peaceful efforts. Whatever the outcome, I fear that we will be remembered simply as the country that brought to this crisis only the will to do battle and not the way to achieve peace. That is not the legacy I want for America.

We will never know, if other choices had been made, if other paths taken, whether other wars might have been averted. But I will not vote to create another generation of grieving families, wondering if their sacrifice might have been spared. I urge my colleagues to weigh the dubious rewards against the certain consequences of a war now. A war at this time would be premature and costly. I urge you to test the faith of this Nation in peace, to test our commitment to patience, and our resolve for restraint. These will be the tests of a new world order. I believe our Nation possesses the strength, the courage, and the will to meet them.

THE 102D CONGRESS MUST ACT ON
CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1991

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, the 102d Congress has before it many tough and complex issues not the least of which is the appropriate Congressional role regarding the crisis in the Persian Gulf.

But while all eyes are riveted on the Middle East—and rightfully so—we cannot in the meantime overlook the myriad of issues on our domestic agenda. Perhaps the most important of these matters is the one which most closely affects us here in Congress and which affects everything we do here. This is the issue of campaign finance reform.

In December 1989 I made the decision to forego Political Action Committee [PAC's] contributions for my 1990 re-election campaign. I made this decision—one which put me at risk financially and politically—because I felt I had to make a strong and unequivocal statement to the people of the Third District of Kentucky about my desire for and commitment to change in the way congressional elections are financed and conducted.

The response back home to my "no-PAC pledge" was overwhelming and affirmative from the grassroots. This positive response has served to strengthen my resolve to continue working for a fundamental change in the Federal election laws in the 102d Congress.

The people really do want change. They want less expensive elections. They want an end to the "soft money" loophole. They want to be a part of the political process again, and they want elections returned to the grassroots and taken away from the big, powerful special interest groups.

Mr. Speaker, to your great credit, the House took a positive step last August when, at your insistence, it took up and passed a solid campaign reform measure. But, the press of business—compounded by the budget impasse—prevented conferences with the other body to seek an agreement on a reform measure. So, the 101st Congress ended without having dealt with campaign finance reform.

Mr. Speaker, the 101st Congress may be history, but the dissatisfaction, cynicism, and unhappiness among our citizens about the political process have not abated. In fact, the situation, if anything, has worsened. The 102d Congress must act swiftly and decisively on real campaign finance reform.

The price for inaction—both at the polls in 1992 and in damage to the institution of Congress and the democratic system—is too great to risk.

On the first day of the 102d Congress, I introduced H.R. 372, a bill to reform the campaign finance laws for congressional races. My bill, which is the same measure which was approved by the House last August (H.R. 5400), is meant only to be a starting point—not the last word—on the path to reforming the campaign laws. We have a long way to go, Mr. Speaker, but the prize awaiting our courage and our action is well worth the effort.

UNIONS URGE PRESIDENT TO LET
THE SANCTIONS WORK

HON. BERNIE SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1991

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, many Americans are expressing grave concern about the prospects of war in the Middle East, including our Nation's working people. I would like to introduce into the RECORD a letter to the President from a group of union presidents that appeared in today's Washington Post:

DEAR PRESIDENT BUSH: We write to you as the Presidents of organizations representing proud and patriotic working people. Because it is working Americans who constitute a high proportion of U.S. military forces, reserves and potential draftees, our members and their spouses, sons and daughters are many among the Operation Desert Shield Troops.

We are gravely concerned about the possibility of a permanent U.S. military presence in the Middle East. We are also concerned that any military action and resulting casualties will be borne largely by American troops.

We yield to no one in our condemnation of Saddam Hussein's reckless invasion of Kuwait and join the world community in insisting on Iraq's immediate withdrawal. At the same time, we believe the economic sanctions—the strongest ever levied against a country in peacetime—must be given a chance to work. Because we support our troops, we emphatically oppose the initiation of offensive military action by the United States at this time.

We urge you to let the sanctions work to achieve the maximum pressure on Iraq before any further blood is shed in this conflict.

Morton Bahr, President, Communication Workers of America. Owen Bieber, President, United Auto Workers. William H. Bywater, President, International Union of Electronic Workers. Keith Geiger, President, National Education Association. James R. Herman, President, International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union. George J. Kourpias, President, International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers. Joseph M. Misbrenner, President, Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers. Jack Sheinkman, President, Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union. John J. Sweeney, President, Service Employees International Union.

CONGRATULATING THE 1990
CARBONDALE TERRIERS

HON. GLENN POSHARD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1991

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to congratulate the people of Carbondale, IL, and the Terriers of Carbondale Community High School.

Under the direction of Coach John Helmick, the 1990 Carbondale Terriers just completed one of the best football seasons in school his-

tory, making it all the way to the semifinals in the Illinois class 4A football championships, further than any previous Carbondale team.

The Terriers finished the regular season with an 8 to 1 record, shutting out their opponents 4 times and scoring 40 points or more in 5 other contests. The Terriers won three games in the playoffs before coming up just short in the semifinals, but in defeat, just as in victory, the Terriers displayed class and composure.

The Southern Illinoisan honored Curtis Daesch as Player of the Year, while the Evansville Courier selected Braden Gibbs. But this was really a team effort, and this group has reached if not exceeded the standards set by those who were previously honored to wear the Terrier black and white.

This season will eventually become numbers and statistics for the record books. But in the hearts and minds of those who played a part in making it happen, it will forever serve as a reminder of what can happen when young people dedicate themselves to setting goals and then work together to achieve them.

I am pleased to represent the fine students of Carbondale Community High School and their football team in the U.S. House of Representatives.

1990 CARBONDALE TERRIERS

Terrance Clayton, Seth Smith, Damian James, Kevin Readell, Brad Schwartz, Charles Zieba, Tim Wilson, Jay Curtis, Braden Gibbs, Marc Willis, Emanuel Gold, Curtis Daesch, Maurice Bonds, Eean Chappell, Preston James, Naseer Khaaliq, Robby Miller, Ike Holder, Scott Simmons, Devin Clark, Matt Bowlby, Mike Fink, Matt Elston, Andrew Siebert, Dominic Meline, Chad McCague, David Lamb, Tony Hunter, Sam Carter, Johnson Bell, Bill Heern, Zach Steed, Pat Langan, Craig Wisinski, Dell Berry, Tariq Khaaliq, Kelly Walton, Nate McDonal, Zach LeBeau, Austin Laster.

Coaches: John Helmick, Skip Heninger, Bob Taylor, Dennis Drust, Clay Brewer, Kevin Helfrich, Dennis Ragan, Bill Patrick. Video: Lindy Loyd. Managers: Todd Helmick, Matt McVey. Statistics: Celeste Bullar, Autumn Miles, Erica Benton, Jennifer Hartlieb, Megan Bates. Cheerleaders: Latoya Rowe, LaKeisha Felder, Tamara Gibbs, Kenyatta Anderson, Alyssa Fayne, Krista Marlow, Sarah Person, Zanzi Neblett, Patra Thiphosithkun, Beth Bivens, Jeannie Durr, Amy Moore, Hilary Shipley, Evony Caldwell, Ellen Mau, Michelle Scott.

R.C. GORMAN'S LOVE FOR NEW
MEXICO

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1991

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago on board a United Airlines flight I picked up the airline's magazine and found the face of a dear friend on its cover.

The story of New Mexico's R.C. Gorman, a Navajo artist, is beautifully told as only R.C. can tell it. There is only one R.C. Gorman and if you have not seen his work, you have not

seen Indian art. He is a world renowned artist most famous for his ability to capture the beauty of Indian women.

I am most proud of R.C., his work, the contributions he has made to his fellow New Mexicans, the tremendous publicity he has brought to New Mexico and his outright love of our beautiful State. I would encourage my colleagues to read this brief story about R.C. Gorman as it appeared in United Airline's December 1990 magazine.

R.C. GORMAN'S NEW MEXICO

R.C. Gorman is New Mexico's most visible, and arguably most prolific, artist. His paintings, sculpture, prints and ceramics are collected worldwide. Proclaimed by the New York Times as the "Picasso of American Indian art," Gorman has made Taos his home for more than 20 years. Although best known for his paintings of strong, magisterial women, Gorman also has a reputation as a generous man who gives much to his state and local community. He has established scholarships for minority high school students and hosts numerous benefits for local causes.

There is a Navajo child's poem that goes like this: "I seem to be working and thinking, but I am really running through a meadow." That poem sums up my life because I love what I do and where I live. I'm enamored of New Mexico, especially Taos. There's certain magic here.

I came here from San Francisco, where I was working and painting, but I grew up on a Navajo reservation in Arizona. We were so poor that my first art materials were rocks, mud and sand from the Chinle Wash. I herded sheep with my mother and Aunt Mary near Canyon de Chelly and often drew in the earth or etched on the canyon walls.

Taos has a long history as an artists' community, and I was curious to see it, so in the mid-1960s, after attending the Indian ceremonial in Gallup, New Mexico, I visited the town as a tourist. I stayed on for a while, and soon the Manchester Gallery in Taos gave me a show that was more successful than anything I had accomplished in San Francisco. This confirmed what I knew instinctively: Taos was where I belonged and needed to be to accomplish my work. I returned to San Francisco, packed my things and moved.

A few years later, I ended up buying the gallery. I changed its name to the Navajo Gallery because I was probably the first Indian to own his own gallery and I wanted to put the Navajos on the map. A young Navajo girl helped me in those early days, and I lived in the gallery and painted in the morning before we opened. I was showing 55 other artists, but none of them sold as well as I did, so I cut it down to myself. Now, I have an international following, and art collectors and tourists come to New Mexico from all over the world. The gallery eventually got too big for me—more and more people and less privacy—so I moved north of Taos.

The Sangre de Cristo mountain range is right outside my back door. The mountains change all the time and I watch them from my studio window. Sometimes Taos Mountain is hooded in clouds. It comforts and encourages you, making you glad you're under its spell. I own all of the land around me, so I will always have a view of the mountain. Lady Brett, who came here in the 1920s with D.H. Lawrence, supposedly said, "If the mountain doesn't like you, it will spew you out." I haven't been spewed yet, so I guess it's accepted me.

When I travel, I don't do any artwork; I don't even take photographs. I have everything I need here in Taos. I've worked through different series: masks, rugs and pottery, but I've been most excited about the women I've painted. My women work the land. They have big hands and strong feet, and they've kept my interest.

Food is another of my interests. The second volume of my book *Nudes & Foods* came out in 1989. It's a collection of my drawings and recipes I've found in my travels. Rose Roybal, my cook and housekeeper, prepares wonderful meals for my friends and guests. I love lamb, and count on my relatives to bring it from the Navajo reservation. There's also a garden on my property—it's actually Rose's—full of squash, beets, tomatoes, garlic and corn.

New Mexico is so vast and unrestricted, you can't help but feel free. The light and color continually stimulate me. As the aspens turn in the fall, they cover the mountains in mottled patches of dull greens and bright yellows. The summers are a rich green and so pleasant that we don't need air-conditioning. Winters are white. This is ski country, and although I don't ski, I love the snow. I have never for a single second thought about relocating. I simply couldn't be any place else. ♦

REASONABLE AND SENSIBLE ENVIRONMENTALISM

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1991

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, because the political agenda of this Nation has been controlled in many ways by environmental extremists we are far too dependent on foreign oil.

If we would develop some of our own natural resources, we could thumb our noses at the Saddam Husseins of the world. This would make situations like the current conflict in Kuwait much less likely.

Some experts believe there could potentially be as much as 29 billion barrels of oil in a very small portion of the 19-million-acre Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska.

If we would develop some of our own oil resources in an environmentally safe manner, we could bring down the price of oil. This would be a great help to the lower and middle income people of this country.

Instead, some environmental extremists want to prohibit almost all oil exploration and drilling. This really ends up helping most of the big oil companies by keeping supplies reduced and thus the price high.

A very fine editorial on this subject appeared in yesterday's Wall Street Journal. I hope all my colleagues will read this article:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 9, 1991]

OIL AND CARIBOU CAN MIX

There is an easy way to separate reasonable environmentalists from ecological extremists. Ask them if they believe in opening up a small strip of land on Alaska's remote northeast coast to oil exploration and drilling. The issue may well set off the most contentious debate of the year in Congress.

The 20-by-100-mile coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is basically a frozen desert, wind-swept and bleak even in

summer. There are no trees, few flowers, and a lot of mosses and lichens. Yet this area may well conceal the last major oil reservoir in North America, one that could rival the nearby Prudhoe Bay discovery that now produces 25 percent of the nation's domestic oil. The Interior Department puts the chances of a major find at one in five as against the oil industry's typical success rate of one in 50.

Some 92 percent of the Maine-sized ANWR area is already off-limits to development. The rest was specifically set aside by Congress in 1980 for possible oil exploration. But this hasn't stopped environmental groups from trying to slap a wilderness label on even this small remainder. The area is used by migrating caribou and other wildlife.

Alaska officials and local Eskimo leaders almost unanimously back development of the coastal strip. They say the Prudhoe Bay field shows that a balance can be struck between the needs of environmental protection and economic growth. In the 12 years since drilling began there, the local caribou herd has tripled in size to 18,000 animals. The 800-mile-long Alaska pipeline has had a superb safety record.

Nor would oil exploration and production disturb much of ANWR. With Prudhoe Bay as a guide, the best estimates are that less than 23 square miles—0.1 percent of ANWR's total area—would be affected by drilling pads, roads and other facilities. All would be removed carefully and the ground reseeded once exploration or drilling was completed.

Bills that would have allowed exploration in ANWR's coastal plain were passed by both House and Senate committees in 1989. Then the Exxon Valdez disaster wiped ANWR off the legislative map. The Gulf crisis has brought the issue front and center again. Last August, the Senate passed an amendment that would open up ANWR and other non-wilderness federal lands to oil and gas development if oil imports rise above 50 percent of domestic demand. They are now 45 percent.

But development of ANWR makes sense regardless of how much oil America imports, and Congress will take up the issue in earnest early this year. The Beltway environmental groups are fighting to keep all of it in perpetual cold storage. A Wilderness Society official says there is a "need to protect the land not just for wildlife and human recreation, but just to have it there."

That is environmental overreaching. It ignores the needs of real Americans, many with low incomes, who have to drive to work every day to support their families and will probably never have the means or the desire to fly 800 miles north of Anchorage, Alaska, and appreciate the stark, wind-swept terrain of ANWR.

Sensible conservationists believe that opening up a small sliver of Alaska's tundra for oil exploration simply recognizes that the welfare of human beings should also be a factor in environmental policy.

ALAMEDA COUNTY CELEBRATES SOLIDARITY WEEKEND

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1991

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, Alameda County is one of the most diversely populated counties in the Nation. This diversity provides its

citizens with the benefits of different cultures, customs, and traditions.

However, recent attacks on residents of this county have taken place solely on the basis of victims' race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, and religion. These recent incidents have threatened the safety and religious freedom of the residents of Alameda County.

To counteract these attacks and to affirm that attacks and incidents such as these have no place in the community, the Alameda County Board of Supervisors has declared the days of January 18, 19, 20, and 21, 1991, as "Solidarity Weekend."

Solidarity Weekend is sponsored by the Interreligious Council of Oakland, the Diocese of Oakland, the East Bay Council of Rabbis, the San Leandro Clergy Association, the Brookfield Athletic Advisory Council, the Black Firemen's Association, the East Bay Regional Parks District, and a number of other civic and community institutions. The weekend will be observed in conjunction with the national observance of the birth of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who dedicated his life to bringing an end to prejudice.

Solidarity Weekend serves as a time in which Alameda County residents can celebrate and appreciate their diversity and their willingness to join and work together. All religious and educational institutions and social and community organizations have been encouraged to dedicate their activities to furthering the causes of equality and mutual respect among the many diverse and varied communities which make up Alameda County.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize January 18 to 21, 1991 as "Solidarity Weekend" in Alameda County.

CIVIL LIBERTIES OF ARAB-AMERICANS

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1991

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, past experience has shown that the preparations for war abroad have often led to the straining of civil liberties at home.

It appears that our current crisis in the Middle East may be no exception.

The FBI's decision to begin interviewing Americans of Arab descent is a cause for grave concern. According to today's Washington Post, Arab-American business and community leaders have been called and questioned in a manner that they find both intimidating and humiliating.

In the tense days ahead, we must of course take every precaution to prevent domestic terrorism.

But we must be equally vigilant in our determination to protect the rights of all Americans, to avoid fanning the flames of anti-Arab backlash, and to ensure that no one group is singled out purely because of their ethnic or religious heritage.

PINELANDS ACQUIRES WWOR-TV

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1991

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect and admiration that I address my colleagues in the House today, for I rise to extend my heartiest congratulations and warmest best wishes to Pinelands, Inc. on its acquiring WWOR-TV.

WWOR-TV programming is directed toward the local audience. The station has a strong record of public service to the New Jersey and Tri-State area. Pinelands is strongly committed to continuing this record of service to the communities in which it operates and will do so by combining on-air resources with off-air activities to make a positive impact.

As part of the A+ for Kids campaign focusing on education, the station has produced 10 original specials aired in prime-time, ongoing new series and an off-air network reaching out to 36,000 teachers in New Jersey. To increase environmental awareness, the station launched a campaign last year named "Help Save the Earth" which continues to focus attention on what individuals can do to improve the world around them.

WWOR-TV has received numerous awards and Emmys for news and public service activities. For its educational efforts, the station became the first broadcaster to be named a "Point of Light" by President Bush.

The management of WWOR-TV has remained through the acquisition. This dynamic team has dedicated the station to serving the community and will continue this proud tradition. Lawrence P. Fraiberg is Pinelands' chairman of the board and chief executive officer and has been active in the television industry from the earliest days. Prior to joining MCA as president of its broadcasting division in 1986, Mr. Fraiberg was president of Westinghouse's Television Station Group and before that president of Metromedia Television. Mr. Fraiberg was honored with a Peabody Award in 1986 for "Lifetime Achievement in the Broadcasting Industry." In 1990, he was the recipient of the Trustees Award from the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences.

Michael B. Alexander, Pinelands' president and chief operating officer, formerly was executive vice president of MCA Broadcasting, Inc., responsible for operating WWOR-TV and participating in the management of MCA's other media interests. He also serves as WWOR-TV's general manager. From 1984 to 1986, Mr. Alexander was vice president and chief financial officer of USA Network.

Jane Hartley is a member of the board of directors of Pinelands, Inc. She was vice president of marketing with MCA Broadcasting, Inc., when MCA acquired WWOR-TV in April 1987 and was essential to making the station the success it is today.

These dedicated and talented individuals bring energy, enthusiasm and vision to WWOR-TV and will continue this station's strong commitment to the communities it serves.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join in paying tribute to Pinelands, Inc. as it continues to provide the invaluable service and truly makes a difference in society. I extend my best wishes to them on this exciting undertaking.

LORRI GORMAN: CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1991

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, libraries are often overlooked as we discuss the great issues before this House—an oversight that should be corrected. Libraries are essential to a literate, competitive, thinking society. They open the doors of learning and literature to everyone who chooses to enter them. That is why I am so pleased to honor Mrs. Lorri Gorman, who has been named as Pelham, NY's Citizen of the Year for her stalwart and tireless work to establish a townwide library in that community.

Over the past 75 years, Pelham has seen no less than a half dozen efforts to establish a library. They did not lack for dedicated citizens or motivated leadership. Each, however, fell by the wayside. But Lorri Gorman would not be deterred, and at long last, Pelham will soon have a townwide library to call its own.

Mrs. Gorman started the current push 4 years ago, along with Chris Emerson, Mary Collins, and Marilyn Parfet. Since then, the Friends of the Town of Pelham Library has enlisted all of the talents and energies that Pelham has to offer. Lawyers, accountants, architects, engineers, and countless other professionals have given their expertise, and numerous individuals have provided financial support to make the library a reality.

A site has now been acquired for the library—a beautiful spot at the center of the community. The fundraising goal is well on its way to being met. The efforts of Mrs. Gorman and the countless others who shared this vital task will soon come to fruition.

John F. Kennedy once said that, "If this nation is to be wise as well as strong, if we are to achieve our destiny, then we need more new ideas for more wise men reading more good books in more public libraries." Lorri Gorman has helped to achieve that destiny in her own community. I salute her, and all the citizens of Pelham. Their work will enrich minds and spirits for generations to come.

IS IRAQ EVADING THE NUCLEAR POLICE?

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1991

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Energy and Commerce Committee had a hearing on the energy implications of the Persian Gulf crisis. During that hearing I pointed out that the President had cited Iraq's efforts to obtain a nuclear bomb as one of the pri-

many reasons for going to war, and asked whether Iraq's ability to do so while remaining a signatory to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and allowing inspections by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) on its soil suggested a fundamental flaw in the current international safeguards system. The witness acknowledged the weaknesses in the IAEA safeguards system, which admitting that the Department of Energy had made no specific recommendations to the President on how to rectify this situation by improving domestic and international controls on the proliferation of dangerous nuclear weapons technologies and materials. I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a very disturbing article which recently appeared in the New York Times which discusses this problem.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 28, 1990]

IS IRAQ EVADING THE NUCLEAR POLICE?

[By Paul Leventhal]

WASHINGTON.—In assessing Iraq's nuclear potential, it's a mistake to focus exclusively on the expertise of Iraqi scientists and nuclear industry. Saddam Hussein doesn't need to manufacture the plutonium and enriched uranium essential for the bomb. He could conceivably buy what he needs in a nuclear black market or simply steal it.

He has tried in the past. In 1982, as documented by an Italian magistrate, Iraqi officials tried to buy 75 pounds of French plutonium for \$82.5 million from two arms dealers who promised but never produced the material.

Unfortunately, there can be no ironclad assurances that Iraq has not already succeeded in acquiring the nuclear explosives it needs to complete its weapons. Inspections, like the twice yearly visits of the International Atomic Energy Agency, can't tell us anything about Iraq's clandestine activities. At best, they can confirm only that the regime's known supplies of imported nuclear fuel are still where they are supposed to be.

These concerns about Iraq expose the central problem of the global nonproliferation system: permitting the use of bomb-grade plutonium and uranium fuels in civilian nuclear power and research programs. The undetected removal of just a tiny percentage of the tons of plutonium in an industrial state like France, Germany, Belgium or Japan would represent a substantial amount of bomb material.

Plant employees have ample opportunity for such diversions. Large nuclear fuel plants in Europe and Japan extract and process tons of plutonium from spent reactor fuel every year. Because of inherent uncertainties in measuring large flows of plutonium, which is processed in liquid or powder form, officials are forced to estimate. If the amount recovered from the fuel falls within a certain margin of error, it is assumed that all the bomb-grade material has been accounted for.

The I.A.E.A. does not come close to achieving its goal of detecting the loss of one bomb's worth of plutonium—17 pounds—per plant per year. In practice, as much as 600 pounds of weapons-grade material could be diverted from a large plant in a year without being recognized as missing.

Physically removing the bomb material from nuclear plants is feasible. A plant employee could be motivated, whether by extortion, ideology or bribery, to transport the material out of the plant and turn it over to an Iraqi agent. It could be concealed in the low-level wastes that, for economic reasons,

are discarded without any monitoring for plutonium.

There are other potential sources of illicit bomb materials. U.S.-supplied bomb-grade uranium is used as fuel in more than 100 research reactors at home and overseas. Also problematic are several experimental facilities, known as critical assemblies, for the designing of nuclear fuels. These use huge amounts of extremely pure, high-grade bomb-grade plutonium and uranium.

Recently, security on 1,100 pounds of U.S.-supplied bomb-grade material at one Japanese facility was found to be so lax that American specialists were called in to develop improvements on a crash basis.

A number of remedial steps should be taken. Extraordinary measures are needed to protect civil nuclear facilities against theft. There should be more frequent I.A.E.A. visits to Iraq—once a week instead of twice a year—to correspond with the minimum time needed to convert the country's known stocks of nuclear fuel into pure uranium for a bomb.

The agency should also exercise its right to conduct special inspections in Iraq to seek out undeclared bomb material or finished weapons. And it should end its policy of keeping the details of its findings secret. Iraq, still a party in good standing to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, should be condemned by the other 140 signatories.

Finally, "peaceful", bomb-grade materials must be replaced with alternative fuels that cannot be turned into weapons. This had been a high U.S. priority until the Reagan and Bush Administrations decided that non-proliferation benefits were not worth the political costs of resisting European and Japanese appetites for plutonium and highly enriched uranium. If there is to be any hope that future crises will be spared a nuclear dimension, the White House must reverse this "see-no-evil" policy.

REINTRODUCTION OF BILL TO AMEND FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT

HON. RICHARD H. LEHMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1991

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced my comprehensive bill to amend the current Federal law regulating the consumer credit reporting industry.

I first introduced this bill, the consumer credit protection amendments, during my tenure in the last Congress as chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs and Coinage. I was prompted to give credit reporting priority attention early in my chairmanship for several reasons. First, the Federal law regulating credit reporting agencies—the Fair Credit Reporting Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-508)—had existed essentially without review or amendment for over 20 years, a fact which seemed quite extraordinary considering the enormous advances in computer capabilities and information sharing during that period. Second, I was hearing more and more stories of people involved in credit reporting problems. Many of these people were unaware of the rights already guaranteed them by the Federal law, or if they did know and understand their rights, they were experiencing real difficulties in exer-

cising them. Many had found significant inaccuracies in reports about them and were running into real problems getting credit or even employment as a result.

HEARINGS ON CONSUMER CREDIT REPORTING IN THE 101ST CONGRESS

While I served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs and Coinage during the last Congress, the subcommittee held two hearings on consumer credit reporting. The first hearing was held September 13, 1989—Serial No. 101-50—and was in the nature of an oversight hearing on the Fair Credit Reporting Act.

Subsequent to the September hearing, three bills to amend the FCRA were introduced, including the comprehensive bill I introduced, H.R. 4213. The bill was drafted to reflect some of the many excellent suggestions for reform of the current law that had been presented to the subcommittee at the September hearing. On June 12, 1990, the subcommittee held a hearing to review those bills—Serial No. 101-132. Quite a few suggestions were made at the hearing and in the written statements with regard to both technical and substantive improvements to the bill.

I have reintroduced my bill without incorporating those suggestions in deference to what will be the new membership of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs and Coinage and the importance of their review of the relevant issues. Hopefully, the bill I have introduced today can serve as a foundation for future review of the law. Without question, many of the suggestions for additional measures or changes to the bill merit close consideration and I hope that the subcommittee will consider them all carefully. I continue to regard this as an extremely important issue on which our attention is long overdue. The tremendous outpouring of support for our efforts last year was clear proof to me of the impact of credit reporting practices on the lives of Americans today.

OVERVIEW OF BILL

I will briefly run through the provisions in my bill. The bill would:

Give consumers the right to inspect all the information in their reporting agency files;

Require reporting agencies and users of reports to furnish a summary of rights and remedies to the consumer along with any FCRA-required disclosure;

Require reporting agencies to investigate inaccuracies in consumer reports and correct them within 30 days of the consumer's request to do so in most circumstances;

Require reporting agencies to send the consumer a written notice when they have finished an investigation so that the consumer will know the outcome;

Require persons who furnish information to reporting agencies—creditors and others—to establish procedures to assure the maximum possible accuracy of the information they furnish, and to alert consumers to the fact that they furnish information about their customers to reporting agencies;

Give consumers the right to one free copy of their report once a year if they ask for it; and

Prohibit reporting agencies from using consumer reports to develop lists for prescreening purpose unless the consumer

has been given a chance to tell the reporting agency not to use their file for such purpose.

The bill also includes a second title that incorporates the Credit Repair Organizations Act introduced by my colleague, Mr. ANNUNZIO of Illinois. That portion of my bill would establish certain guidelines for the operations of credit repair clinics, requiring them to provide disclosures to consumers about fees and services and prohibiting them from certain practices, such as making misleading statements about the services they can perform for the consumer.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT A USEFUL TOOL

HON. ROD CHANDLER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1991

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, the budget process last year was extremely frustrating. The job of developing a fair and rational plan proved to be a nearly impossible task. Ultimately, we were able to pass a budget package which included some real deficit reduction.

Few people will be totally satisfied with every aspect of the final package; I know I am not. I would have preferred a budget that relied on fewer tax increases and greater spending cuts. However, election-year politics made this virtually impossible.

In the 102d Congress, several of my colleagues and I will be trying to gain support for a balanced-budget amendment to the Constitution. We believe this would be a useful tool to force Congress and the President to make tough choices to help eliminate the budget deficit.

Listed below are the names of over 200 of my constituents who have asked me to make public their support for a balanced-budget amendment to the Constitution:

Valois Akers, Margaret Alcorn, W.E. and Dail Anderson, Manson Backus, Carroll and Pearl Bagley, Richard Becker, Kay Bell, Leland and Muriel Biermann, Clyde and Emily Bovee, Thomas and Marie Bowie, Mary Sandra Boyd, Douglas and Alyce Brandner, Clement and Alice Brewer.

John C. Brown, Josephine Burr, Audrey and Allen Carter, Michael Chandler, Kathy Cochran, W.A. and Sharon Cochran, Norman and Wanda Collins, William E. Condell, Jack L. Cooper, Gloria M. Coty, Craig A. Coty, Eunice B. Cummings, Eunice B. Cummings.

Milton Curtis, Patrick J. Dadosio, T. Dayton Davies, John Davis, Dale and Reinada Drain, Eleanor Dye, Marvin and Martha Eisenbach, J.V. and Ellen Eliot, Edwin P. and Alice Evans, Robert and Mildred Ewing, A. Fischer, G.W. Frampton, Michael and Dana Freeland.

Harold A. Frethiem, Howard Fultz, William and Elizabeth Galloway, Raymond Garrett, Ruth Godley, Steven M. Goldberg, Dolores Gorham, Glenna Griffith, Richard Grillo, Phyllis Guldseth, Paul and Galia Haggard, Mr. and Mrs. Richard Hammond, Clayton and Mabel Hanson.

George and Dorothy Hanson, Robert Harper, Norman and Verone Heinsen, Mr. R.H. Hendrickson, Norma E. Herrick, Laurence R. Hilden, Robert W. Hoffman, Robert W. Hoff-

man, G.N. Holter, Gene G. Hopp, Arthur and Helen Anne Hoppe, Lucy Housner, W.E. Hubbard.

Charles Hutchens, Michael and Linda Imhoff, George and Eunice Irvine, James C. Isom, Howard and Alta Jackson, F.L. and Lyndell Jacobs, Lynda Jenkins, B. Jensen, Maurice and Margaret Keating, Brian and Betty Jane Kirkpatrick, W. Kleiner, Phyllis L. Knick, Mr. and Mrs. Gary H. Knutson.

Annette Langille, Clarence Linscott, James and Anne Luckman, Elizabeth MacKillop, Joseph and Marie Marci, Karl and June Martinson, Robert May, Betty Mayes, James and Vivian McClellan, C. Lynn McGill, Leroy and Jean Anne McVay, George and Florence Metcalf, Keith D. Miller.

Egon Molbak, H.C. and Roseann Munson, Jesse Myers, Michael G. Nelson, Paul Nitardy, John and Ilene Nitardy, Charles and Virginia Nomellini, Rodney Norris, Michael Nykreim, Barbara J. and Roland Orle, Janet Osborn, Chas and Evelyn Partridge, Thea J. Pettit.

Blaine Powell, Phil Prigge, Ralph and Elizabeth Queal, David and Nancy Raymond, Edward and Carole Rich, Robert and Jean Rutherford, Stanley and Stephanie Sankey, Sarah Schaper, William and Patricia Schaumberg, Leonard Schroeter, Robert Setzer, Walter Shields, Ronald Sickles.

Ronald and Dolores Sickles, Julia Stickles, Charles E. Skinner, Marjorie and Kazimer Skubi, William C. Slater, Harriette G. Smith, C. Coburn Smith, Desmond Francis Smith, Richard and Jan Stout, Sidney and Virginia Svendsen, Vivienne J. Templeton, Larry and Mary Ellen Thien, Susan Tucker.

Clark T. Turner, Leonard Vandenaere, Rosalea Vanek, Alice M. Vlasick, Lillie Wagner, Agnes Wallington, Harry Wampler, Herbert Ward, Jeffrey Webbar, Hazel Weyerman, Bruce A. Whipps, John Whitaker, Belleville and Judith Whitehead.

Belleville Whitehead III, Peter and Priscilla Wiedemann, Betty and Cal Wilson, Lyly and Dorothy Wood, John and Sara Yerkes, Renee Zeiger, Raymond and Shirley Zipp.

I will be working hard to move a balanced-budget amendment through the legislative process and I am hopeful that the 102d Congress will approve such a measure.

THE PLIGHT OF THE BALTIC PEOPLES

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1991

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the eyes of the Congress and indeed the world are focused intently upon the present volatile situation in the Middle East, I ask my fellow Members to take note of another crisis, another situation where human lives are at stake, a situation where the basic human rights of freedom and equal justice are being ignored.

I call your attention to those independent peoples who live in the region known as the Baltic Republics—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. These independent states have been brutally invaded by the Army of the Soviet Union. This week, 10,000 crack paratroops invaded these three Baltic Republics at the direction of the leadership in Moscow. This act was perpetrated without any provocation on the part of

the Baltic governments, or their people. The immediate goal of this invasion was to arrest and confine the significantly large number of Baltic youths who have refused to be conscripted into Soviet military service. These courageous young men have always known that being a Latvian, Estonian, or Lithuanian is not the same as being a Soviet. History has taught them that lesson.

In 1939, the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact between Adolph Hitler and Joseph Stalin allowed the Soviet Union to unjustly occupy these previously free states. Stalin took this opportunity to extend his brutal regime by sending in tanks and infantry to instill "order." For 50 years, the Baltic States have been engaged in a struggle against a systematic russification process that has denied them the freedom and economic independence they enjoyed after World War I. The events of this week illustrate that this fight continues to be waged.

Mr. Speaker, the world is no longer divided along East-West lines. The peoples of these smaller countries with economies ravaged by over 45 years of communism need a clear example from the United States about how to chart their futures. It is clear that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is going through a difficult and tumultuous period of change. I commend the past efforts of Mr. Gorbachev, but in regards to the Baltic States he is acting more like a dictator than a recent recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize. He continues to rely upon the military and its policy of subjecting independent peoples to violence and persecution. It is more than obvious that Mr. Gorbachev is succumbing to the Soviet impulse to control the needs and desires of its citizenry by using military force and violence. Using our own system as the example, it is the responsibility of this Congress to clearly state, "This is deplorable and will not be accepted."

Now is the time to send a message to President Bush requesting that he convey to President Gorbachev our position on this issue. Although there are other areas of the world that give concern to the American people, the injustices committed in the Baltic states should remain uppermost in our minds. I strongly urge my colleagues to speak their minds on this issue, if only to assure Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians everywhere that the eyes of the most democratic nation on Earth are indeed focused on their plight.

MEET SADDAM HUSSEIN'S AG- GRESSION NOW OR PAY FOR IT LATER

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1991

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, not many weekly newspapers in small-town America are editorially active on international affairs. The Dodge Criterion of Dodge, NE, is obviously exceptional. This Member invites his colleagues' attention to the following signed prescient editorial by Mr. Ken Kauffold in the January 10, 1991, edition of that newspaper. Following that editorial this Member has also included for his colleagues' attention an out-

standing editorial of the same date from the newspaper at the other end of the scale, the Omaha World-Herald, which is the largest newspaper in the State of Nebraska from its largest city.

[From the Dodge Criterion, Jan. 10, 1991]
 "OUT OF THE KAUFFE KEN"
 (By Ken Kauffold)

Dodge along with the rest of the world is anxiously awaiting the outcome of the crisis in the Persian Gulf before the U.N. backed January 15th deadline. Those are our sons and daughters over there in Saudi Arabia awaiting the order (if it comes) to advance on the Iraq invaders in Kuwait. Hussein says he will never give up Kuwait. He says it is all part of Iraq anyway. The tiny Arab government had no large army with which to keep Iraq and Hussein from taking over. Thus the U.S. and United Nations majority oppose what has happened to Kuwait. If we do not, will Hussein seek to advance his empire in other surrounding countries? Saddam Hussein has said that if he is opposed in the Kuwait takeover he will attack Israel. This effort will be seen by experts as a try to get Arabs everywhere united against the Jewish Nation. If the U.S. and U.N. do not follow through with promises to oust Hussein from Kuwait, then Iraq will literally dictate the price of oil for the next decade and more importantly most Arab foreign policy.

Former Secretary of State Schulze said that Saddam Hussein should also be punished for his war crimes against Kuwait and the many people who not only lost their businesses, but their lives in the takeover. Present Secretary of State James A. Baker III is meeting with Tariq Aziz, the Iraq Foreign Minister in Geneva. There are those who fear whether peace can actually be put to rest when tanks rumble in the area. Even if Iraq pulls out of Kuwait by the deadline, will all of the U.N. requests be met? Will we really see peace? That will bring into focus a whole new set of questions. Will Hussein be content to stay home with his million man ready army? Perhaps not—We must take a stand now—or we surely will pay dearly for it later.

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Jan. 10, 1991]

PRESIDENT NEEDS SUPPORT AS THE WAR CLOUDS GATHER

The Persian Gulf crisis is a nightmare. Hopes that war may be avoided dwindled Wednesday when Iraqi Foreign Minister Tariq Aziz, in talks with Secretary of State James Baker, refused to commit Iraq to a withdrawal from conquered Kuwait. He even refused to acknowledge that the rape of Kuwait had occurred.

Thus Americans will go about their business today with the chilling thought that U.S. forces may be ordered into battle in the very near future. Hearts go out to the men and women in the desert and to the families of people serving in the armed forces. Prayers are offered for the safety of Americans overseas.

Few Americans welcome the prospect of armed conflict. War is tragic even when the cause is just and the national interest clearly defined, which some Americans don't feel is the case in the Persian Gulf. War means terror and suffering for individuals, separation and loss for families, political stress and expense for nations.

War changes societies, not always for the better. It has social, political and economic consequences that can seldom be foreseen or controlled.

War must consequently be a last resort. So long as America has any way to avoid a large-scale land war in the Iraqi desert, the nation's leaders should pursue it.

This isn't to suggest that the time has come for the United States to concede Kuwait to Saddam Hussein. Fair-minded people should hope that day will never come.

Nor do we mean to suggest that the West should reward the Iraqi president with one of the concessions he demands—a regional conference that would make him a hero in the eyes of Israel-haters throughout the Muslim world.

To capitulate to Hussein now would be to accommodate a man who some Middle East experts have called a skilled brinksman, a man who may believe he can have his way by winning a battle of nerves with George Bush.

The United Nations deadline for Iraqi forces to leave Kuwait is five days away. Other diplomatic efforts were under discussion almost as soon as the Baker-Aziz talks ended. Nothing prevents an extension of the diplomatic efforts even if Tuesday passes with Iraqi still in Kuwait.

In other words, despite the grim, almost sad, mood of Baker's press conference Wednesday, time has not run out. Bush still has room to use his preparations for war as a tool to bring about a peaceful, honorable solution. He is more likely to succeed if he has the support of Congress and the American people.

THE MICHIGAN SCENIC RIVERS ACT OF 1991

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1991

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, today I am once again introducing the Michigan Scenic Rivers Act of 1991, legislation to permanently protect several free-flowing rivers in the State of Michigan from possible degradation. This legislation overwhelmingly passed the House of Representatives last year, but the U.S. Senate was unable to consider this bill before it adjourned sine die.

Mr. Speaker, in 1968 the Congress enacted the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to provide a mechanism by which the Federal Government can protect free-flowing rivers. In establishing this program, the Congress believed that so many rivers in our Nation have been lost by dams, channels and over-development, that some outstandingly remarkable rivers should be preserved.

The legislation I am introducing will designate 15 rivers, covering 554 miles, as part of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Program. These rivers are all within the boundaries of the Hiawatha National Forest, the Huron-Manistee National Forest, and the Ottawa National Forest. In addition, nine other river segments, including some rivers on State land, will be studied for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Program.

The State of Michigan is fortunate to be located around the Great Lakes, home to nearly 95 percent of our Nation's fresh water supply. By protecting these rivers, which feed into the Great Lakes, this bill ensures that our water resources will be protected and will continue to be the backbone of our State's economic

future. The Michigan Scenic Rivers Act of 1991 is supported by major environmental groups, including the Michigan United Conservation Clubs, American Rivers, Trout Unlimited, National Wildlife Federation, National Parks and Conservation Association, and the Sierra Club.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a tremendous amount of misinformation concerning the Michigan Scenic Rivers Act of 1991 and the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. I would like to take this opportunity to set the record straight on a number of issues that have been misrepresented by opponents of this bill.

First, it is a common myth that the Michigan Scenic Rivers Act of 1991 will give the U.S. Forest Service greater condemnation authority, and will place restrictions on private landowner's property. Actually, without the passage of the Michigan Scenic Rivers Act of 1991, the U.S. Forest Service would have virtual unlimited authority to acquire all private lands within the boundary of Michigan three national forests through purchase, exchange or condemnation. The Michigan Scenic Rivers Act of 1991 places restrictions on these acquisition authorities. Under the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, if 50 percent of the lands within a designated river corridor are publicly owned, then condemnation in fee title is prohibited. All of the rivers to be designated under this bill have more than 50 percent public ownership, thus restricting the condemnation authority of the U.S. Forest Service.

And while the U.S. Forest Service does have the right to condemn a scenic easement, it rarely uses that authority. Scenic easements are used to prevent an adverse development, and they allow the property owner to keep title to the land to continue to use it, they allow the owner to also sell the land, or pass it on to their heirs. However, it must be understood that the U.S. Forest Service currently has the authority to condemn scenic easements, but this procedure is rarely used. As a matter of fact, of the 853,000 acres of land designated under the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and managed by the U.S. Forest Service, only one-half of 1 percent of the scenic easements were condemned.

Second, this legislation will not grant additional acquisition or zoning authorities to the U.S. Forest Service. In fact, the Michigan Scenic Rivers Act restricts the ability of the U.S. Forest Service to acquire land. As I mentioned earlier, the U.S. Forest Service currently has unlimited acquisition authority for lands inside the boundaries of every national forest. However, the original National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act prohibits the U.S. Forest Service from acquiring more than an average of 100 acres per mile on both sides of the river. It should also be understood zoning decisions concerning the construction of a house, an addition to one's home, or the painting of one's house, are all made by State and local zoning authorities. The fact is the U.S. Forest Service has no zoning authority. This bill calls for the development of a management plan which will act as a guide for activities within the designated corridors. Once this plan has been implemented, with local government involvement, the Federal Government is barred from purchasing land or easements from unwilling sellers.

Most importantly, in our own State of Michigan, two rivers have already been designated as part of the National Rivers System, the Pere Marquette in 1978, and the Au Sable in 1984. The Pere Marquette has 66 percent private ownership along its designated corridor, more private land than any other river in this legislation. This is significant because the large amount of private land allows the Forest Service unlimited condemnation authority. Yet, over this 12 year period, the Forest Service has not done one condemnation of any kind. Not one! The Au Sable River is significantly less developed than the Pere Marquette, and has similar features to those rivers in the Upper Peninsula, yet there has not been one condemnation on that river either. Not one!

Also, the National Wild and Scenic River Act does not prohibit the building of new homes within the corridor. On the designated Upper Delaware River, hundreds of new homes have been built within the river corridor. With nearly 500 landowners along the Au Sable and Pere Marquette Rivers, several new homes have been built, and people have painted their houses.

Third, I believe that timber harvesting on national forest lands is an important part of the multiple-use philosophy on our national forests. In fact, the Michigan Scenic Rivers Act of 1991 would actually assist the timber industry in Michigan. At this time, all of the river corridors in this bill are essentially being managed as wilderness areas until the U.S. Congress designates these rivers, or the rivers are fully studied by the U.S. Forest Service, a process which could take a number of years. By approving this legislation, the timber industry would be able to harvest timber on nearly 90 percent of the lands in this bill. Thus, as a result of this bill, they would actually be able to cut more timber than under current law.

Fourth, National Wild and Scenic River designation does not have a negative impact on local land values. On the contrary, several studies have shown that land values have actually increased in river corridors that have received Federal wild and scenic river designation.

For example, the New River in rural North Carolina was included in the National Rivers System in 1976 as a result of a proposed hydroelectric project that would have inundated 40,000 acres of mostly private lands. Before the river was designated, the average cost of land was \$250 per acre. After designation, however, the local realty interests treated the designation as a realty and began to promote the area for second home development. Now there are examples of tracts of land being sold along the river corridor for \$10,000 per acre for second home development. On the Upper Delaware National Scenic River, land values along the river corridor doubled from the designation year 1978 to 1986, while in nearby areas outside the Delaware Valley land values barely increased at all.

Further, on the Rogue River in Oregon, land values inside the designated corridor increased at a modest rate, while land values outside the river corridor actually declined.

During a field hearing on this legislation on July 14, 1991, I asked opponents of this legislation to document cases where land values have actually declined after a river has been

designated. At this time, not one case has been submitted to my office. Clearly, the facts show that Federal designation will have a positive effect on land values.

Mr. Speaker, the Michigan Scenic Rivers Act of 1991 is an important piece of environmental legislation. The enactment of this bill will double the number of rivers in the National Wild and Scenic River System east of the Mississippi River. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation when it is considered by the full House of Representatives.

LEMON SPRINGS UNITED METHODIST CHURCH: PRIDE IN OUR PAST

HON. H. MARTIN LANCASTER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1991

Mr. LANCASTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay homage to a great landmark in my District in North Carolina. Lemon Springs United Methodist Church was founded in 1890 as Midway Church. On November 6, 1890, Midway Church was organized with 24 members. The name Midway was chosen because it was midway between Raleigh and Hamlet, North Carolina. Later the name was changed to Lemon Springs to honor the mineral springs located on the Lemon property approximately 3 miles west of the church on the Carthage (U.S. 15-501).

Talk of a new church building was started in 1920. In March of 1924 a crowd gathered and tore down the old church building. Some of the materials were used in the new building. Francis Willett, one of the church members, remembers a special service on August 2, 1924 when the cornerstone was set. He says Mr. Argus Upchurch, a local mason, brought a bucket of cement and trowel and sealed the stone as Francis stood on the church porch watching.

Rosa and Mattie Smith more recently left a portion of their estate to the church. Through their generosity many improvements have been made. These include an outdoor pavilion, complete with picnic tables, and the paving of the parking lot. Another addition that has been made is the gazebo the Methodist men have built near the front of the cemetery. These are but two examples of how the congregation as a whole and individual members have made this one of the outstanding churches in the area.

On the evening of May 2, 1990 a tornado roared through Lemon Springs, uprooting many of the old oaks around the church building and in the parsonage yard. The church building also needed repairs as a result of the storm. A portion of the parsonage roof was destroyed when an Oak tree fell through the roof. Many trees are gone, many homes were damaged or destroyed, but only one person was injured.

The church continues to recover from this horrible event. Nevertheless, as it has in the past, Lemon Springs United Methodist has shown strength in times of adversity and grown even stronger.

I am honored to be able to pay tribute to such an outstanding keeper of the faith on the

occasion of its centennial. With outstanding clergy and lay leadership and with a devoted and hard working membership, I am confident that God will continue to richly bless Lemon Springs United Methodist Church in its second century.

TRIBUTE TO MAX ROSSI

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1991

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor Mr. Max Rossi, as a longtime friend of mine, who is retiring from the county of Solano after 23 years of service.

Mr. Rossi has been a dedicated servant to the community as assistant assessor of Solano County serving assessors Ellard Williams, Gordon Gokovich, and current assessor Robert Blechschmidt. He also previously served the county as supervising auditor-appraiser. Max has made a significant contribution through his efforts to establish the first automated assessment system. Further, in 1980, Max has been credited with playing an instrumental role in the development of the computerized integrated property system.

Max's career as a public servant is complimented by his exemplary service as a leader in the community. Max was president of the Fairfield-Suisun Chamber of Commerce, and he was deservedly recognized for his dedication and hard work when, in 1976, the chamber named him man of the year. Max has also exhibited leadership by serving as a fundraiser for the Napa-Solano United Crusade and, in 1988, as president of the Sons of Italy. Max was also a member and president of the board of trustees for Solano Community College for 15 years—one of his most notable roles—which is indicative of his dedication to improving community education. In addition, Max was instrumental in insuring that the YMCA locate in the Fairfield-Suisun area. And, his dedication to the community continues to this day as he is chairman of the North Bay Health Care Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, Max has excelled as a community leader and has taken great pride in his job as assistant assessor. I wish him luck in all his future endeavors and congratulate him on all his past achievements.

ONCE AGAIN, THE BUREAUCRACY RECEIVES A FAILING GRADE

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1991

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues an article which recently appeared in the Atlanta Journal entitled "Engineer's math not good enough for high school."

Mr. Ira Joseph, who has his degree in aerospace engineering and 78 credits of college math from two very distinguished universities, was recently forced out of his teaching job in

a Henry County, Georgia school. State officials said he's not qualified to teach high school on a full-time basis.

For many years we have heard that there is a severe shortage of math teachers in America. Henry County, Georgia was fortunate to have a teacher, such as Mr. Joseph, who was eager to teach and, according to both the students and principal at the school, was very effective.

I hope that after reading this article, each of my colleagues is challenged to devote some serious thought on what we can do to improve the quality of education in America.

**ENGINEER'S MATH NOT GOOD ENOUGH FOR
HIGH SCHOOL**
(By Betsy White)

Trained as an aeronautical engineer, Ira Joseph decided at age 50 to teach math instead.

For the principal who hired him and the students who studied with him. It was a dream come true. Despite a well-publicized shortage of qualified math teachers, they'd found one who knew math inside out and was eager to teach at their school.

But for Mr. Joseph, it soon turned into a nightmare.

The state declared he wasn't qualified to teach high school math and forced Henry County school officials to fire him.

For a man who earned 78 credits of college math at West Point and Virginia Tech and took such math-laden engineering courses as fluid mechanics and principles of aerodynamics, that was hard to swallow.

"An engineer should certainly be able to teach high school math," he said. "Believe me, I'm not going to have any troubles with algebra or geometry."

Caro Feagin, Georgia's associate director of certification, said she can understand his frustrations but can't solve them.

The problem, she said, is that Mr. Joseph took most of his math courses as a college freshman and sophomore, then took engineering classes in his junior and senior years. Georgia requires would-be math teachers to take six math classes beyond the sophomore level.

"My heart goes out to him," she said. "If I had all this math, I would know I could teach. * * * I have no problem wanting him in the classroom."

"But he hasn't had the upperdivision math courses," she said. "And right now in Georgia, that's what you need to teach math."

Mr. Joseph would have to take at least three more upperlevel math courses, Mrs. Feagin said. Then he could start teaching on a temporary license while taking education courses on the side.

The rules that require him to take more math probably should be changed, she conceded. An advisory committee already has recommended giving would be math teachers some credit for studying math via physics and engineering courses.

But it will be months before that proposal, and similar plans to ease rigid requirements in English and science, come before the state Board of Education, which has final say over certification rules.

That would be too late for Mr. Joseph, who's already lost his job. He still is fighting the state's ruling in his case, and his students say they hope he wins.

"I think he should be able to stay," said Tanaka Carter, 16, a student in a Stockbridge High School geometry course where Mr. Joseph substitute-taught last week. "He seems to have no problems teaching math,

and he explains things a whole lot better than some of them that I've had."

A VETERAN TALKS FOR THE FLAG

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1991

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to call to your attention a poem written by Mr. Aldo Capotosti, the New Jersey department commander of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States and a veteran of World War II. The poem personifies the symbol that we, as Americans, will look to in these times of turmoil—our American flag.

Mr. Capotosti expresses the feelings of many of our Nation's veterans concerning the symbol that has sustained through wars and conflicts around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to present Mr. Capotosti's work. I hope that all who read it will remember to look to our flag as a symbol of strength during this time of uneasiness.

A VETERAN TALKS FOR THE FLAG

Am I not the symbol of your Country?
You veterans of all wars have protected me from aggression.

From the early wars, when my field had only thirteen stars, to the present time with my field of fifty stars.

So now that my field of stars is complete—why do you, my protectors, veterans of all wars, let them tread on me, disgrace me and above all allow them to burn me.

I have been in many battles with you, and you held me high above all other flags.

I still fly over your capital above all others. Again I ask you, why do you let them burn me?

They say that they express themselves by burning me. I say to them—you can talk, I can not, so express yourself with words.

On Iwo Jima, you died to raise me on the mountain top. I am still your symbol and will always fly over your Capital—protect me.

Now again I say to you my subjects—defend me like you did in battle.

When one kills our national bird, the bald Eagle, that person is reprimanded—why can't I have the same respect?

I will always be your flag, therefore I say again, protect me.

God Bless America.

**TRIBUTE TO JUDGE THOMAS S.
DELAY**

HON. BOB MCEWEN

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1991

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Speaker, as public servants, we as Members of Congress, have the frequent opportunity to meet and work with scores of dedicated individuals who play a critical role in the functions of the communities in our home States. They faithfully execute the responsibilities for making, interpreting and enforcing the law at the local and statewide level.

Occasionally, among those many devoted State and local officials, we find an individual of such unusual distinction and accomplishment that his work requires special notice. That is my purpose in rising today.

It is with great pride and pleasure that I ask you to join me in recognizing Judge Thomas S. Delay on the occasion of his retirement from the Jackson County Common Pleas Court. Upon becoming acquainted with Judge Delay's distinguished career, I am confident that my colleagues will be anxious to join the citizens of Jackson County along with Judge Delay's family and friends in saluting his contributions to the legal profession and the bench, which he served with utmost integrity and honesty.

Mr. Speaker, Judge Delay began his distinguished career in the legal profession following the receipt of his Juris Doctor degree from the University of Cincinnati Law School in 1952. He served in both private practice and as a Jackson County prosecuting attorney before assuming the post of judge in the Probate-Juvenile Division of the Jackson County Common Pleas Court. In all of his endeavors he was known by all as a just and responsible public servant who consistently demonstrated a deep faith in, and dedication to, the principles of American jurisprudence.

While dutifully performing his roles in our judicial system, Judge Delay also served as an active member of the Jackson County and Ohio State Bar Associations, the Ohio Prosecuting Attorneys Association, and the National District Attorneys Association. He brought to the bench, and to each of these organizations, dignity, and determination tempered with wisdom and understanding.

Mr. Speaker, Jackson County, OH, has been fortunate, very fortunate, to enjoy the dedicated service of Judge Thomas S. Delay. He has earned the gratitude and respect of all whom he served. I urge my colleagues to join me today in commending Judge Delay for his years of honorable service as an exemplary member of the Ohio Bar and at the bench of the Jackson County Common Pleas Court.

**NEBRASKA EDITORIAL REGARDING
THE VETO OF THE CIVIL
RIGHTS ACT OF 1990**

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1991

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, at the end of the session of the 101st Congress, an interesting editorial was published in the Norfolk Daily News on October 29, 1990, applauding President Bush's veto of the Civil Rights Act of 1990. This Member wanted to provide it today for my colleagues' information. This issue is relevant since it seems nearly certain to be revisited by the 102d Congress.

[From the Norfolk (VA) Daily News, Oct. 29, 1990]

COURAGE IN THE VETO

President Bush and 34 members of the U.S. Senate exhibited courage in spite of a massive publicity campaign by those who claim to be the only authentic promoters of civil

rights. Mr. Bush vetoed what was described as the "major civil rights legislation of 1990." The 34 senators were those who upheld that veto—all Republicans. By one vote, that was sufficient to sustain the veto and kill the bill for this term.

Mr. Bush has an alternative measure which does not contain the flaws of the defeated bill. His would eliminate forced quota systems as a legitimate device to deal with discrimination and also keep in place in the civil rights field the traditional American concept of justice. That is, those who claim to be victims of discrimination in the job market, or anywhere else it is illegal, should be compelled to prove the claim rather than have those charged with the crime prove their innocence.

Aside from its promotion of quota systems, that presumption of guilt on the part of employers charged with discrimination was the major flaw in the 1990 civil rights bill. The burden of proving no discrimination was wrongly placed on defendants in such suits, not the parties bringing the suit.

Those who identify themselves as the civil rights movement's true believers think the Supreme Court has erred in recent rulings which do not recognize an individual's inherent "right" to special advantage or treatment because of minority status (or majority status, in the case of women).

Their basic problem is that they want to overrule the "equal rights" provisions of the Constitution, to make it clear that discrimination to right old wrongs is justified even though unequal treatment results. Legislators and the courts have gone along with this to an extent that finds affirmative action programs in place to overcome old discriminatory patterns and to assist some people but not others—whether on the basis of race, disability or other disadvantaged status.

There is little protest about this where the needs are clear. But such needs cannot be proven to apply to entire groups of people, only to individuals. Some people need and deserve special help. Government has been

helpful in providing it; private agencies might do even more were it not for all the laws and regulations about "equal opportunity" which force any employer to fear the long arm of the law and the regulators at each step.

Congress could serve the civil rights movement best by refusing to create more complications for employers and educational institutions, either large or small. There are enough. The American education and economic systems must be free to create more opportunities, and to do it without Uncle Sam's heavy hand guiding every move. Above all, politicians must remember they can provide no special privileges or benefits for anyone without, in some way, discriminating against others.

MASS TRANSIT AN INVESTMENT IN THE FUTURE

HON. DEAN A. GALLO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1991

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce a bill that will encourage employers to create a realistic employee incentive which will convince more commuters to take mass transit. The benefits of this legislation include energy conservation, easing traffic, and congestion, and most importantly will allow all of us to breathe a little easier.

Early in 1990, I first introduced this bill because clean air and traffic congestion gratified long support for this idea from the port authority, the New Jersey Department of Transportation, and numerous ride-sharing organizations. This year I introduce my bill with even more conviction than in the past. Given the current situation and uncertainty in the Persian Gulf it has become especially important for the

United States to have a national energy strategy to address our energy concerns.

My bill provides a monthly tax incentive up to \$75 a month for employers to encourage their employees to either use mass transit, including ferries, organized van pools as alternatives to single occupant vehicle commuting, and most other modes of mass transit.

Current Federal policies create disincentives for mass transit use and van pooling. The time has come to level the playing field so that commuters will have realistic alternatives. I am confident that any costs associated with my bill can be offset by energy savings and increased compliance with new clean air requirements.

In spite of some resistance by the Ways and Means Committee during the 101st Congress, I believe this is an idea whose time has come. This year I am pleased to learn that Representative FRANK GUARINI, who is a member of the committee, has chosen to join the fight for affordable mass transit in the 102d Congress.

In addition, as a member of the Republican Energy Task Force appointed to offer constructive proposals toward a comprehensive energy policy, I am working with my colleagues to include my initiative in the final proposal.

This is a free-enterprise solution to several problems that does not rely on overregulation and subsidies. It is also a way of promoting greater energy independence, and increasing ridership on mass transit which, in turn, helps to keep fares low and to provide money for service improvements.

Mass transit represents a necessary investment in the future of our Nation. Continued economic development and continued improvement in the quality of our lives will not be possible without it.